



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/805,678

03/18/2004

Pekka Ketola

915-005,099

8566

4955

7590

04/16/2008

WARE FRESSOLA VAN DER SLUYS & ADOLPHSON, LLP

BRADFORD GREEN, BUILDING 5

755 MAIN STREET, P O BOX 224

MONROE, CT 06468

EXAMINER

ALVESTIEFFER, STEPHEN D

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2175

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

04/16/2008

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/805,678

Applicant(s)

KETOLA ET AL.

Examiner

STEPHEN ALVESTEFFER

Art Unit

2175

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 22 January 2008.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-3, 5-16, 18-30 and 33-39 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-3, 5-16, 18-30 and 33-39 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

This Office Action is responsive to the amendment filed January 22, 2008.

Claims 1, 12-15, 24, 25, and 30 are currently amended. Claims 4, 17, 31, and 32 are cancelled. Claims 34-39 are new. Claims 1, 15, 30, and 39 are independent. Claims 1-3, 5-16, 18-30, and 33-39 remain pending.

Minor corrections to the specification are acknowledged.

The Examiner thanks Applicant for pointing out a citation error in the previous Office Action where IBM Technical Disclosure Bulletin NN9207425 was identified, but reference was instead made to IBM Technical Disclosure Bulletin NA9309583. The error has been corrected in this Office Action.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-3, 5-9, 11-16, 18-30, 33, and 37-39 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kraft, United States Patent 6,309,305, and Johnson, United States Patent 6,005,928.

Regarding claim 1, Kraft teaches a method for transferring data from a source application to a target application (see Kraft column 1 lines 46-55; *"there is provided a*

method of transferring data from one application to another”), the method comprising: extracting at least one item from said operation (see Kraft column 1 line 56 through column 2 line 4; “*the complex data structure is analyzed, and predetermined types of subitems in the complex data structure are identified*”, the identified subitems are extracted from the said operation), recording said item into a file automatically (see column 1 lines 56-67; “*The transfer is handled by copying data to clipboard storage means as a complex data structure*”, the clipboard storage means is equivalent to the file), calling said file by the target application for selecting and pasting the item to said target application (see Kraft column 1 lines 46-55; “*displaying said types of subitems for selection by the user upon reception of a pasting request for the data on the clipboard into said another application*”). Kraft does not explicitly teach tracing the latest operation relating to the source application automatically right after said operation has occurred. Johnson teaches tracing a latest communication relating to the source application automatically right after said operation has occurred (see Johnson column 4 line 54 through column 5 line 5; “*the present invention allows a user to automatically retrieve address book data (e.g., addressing information) into an application running on the user's computer with the use of a graphical user interface (GUI), or hot keys. For example, assume the user has recently received a telephone call. The user can move the cursor on screen and paste the name of that recent caller, paste the caller's E-mail ID, paste the caller's phone number, paste the caller's fax number, paste the caller's pager number, or paste the caller's LAN address directly into a file, or application, that is open on the user's computer. According to the present invention, the ability of the user*

to insert this information is a direct result of the person simply communicating to the user. In the example, information about the caller is automatically derived from the address book record in the AB 120 associated with the caller. Thus, the information associated with the caller can be inserted into any application on the user's computer that supports conventional cut and paste clipboard functions, such as those common to window-based GUI's"). Johnson's invention does not require the user to explicitly select a copy command to trace the operation. Rather, Johnson's invention will automatically trace the operation and place the relevant information into the clipboard for pasting into a target application. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to automatically trace communications as taught by Johnson in the intelligent copy and paste application taught by Kraft in order to eliminate the step of looking up relevant information from another application (such as an address book), copying the information, and then pasting it into a target application(see Johnson column 1 line 54 through column 2 line 7; "the user is saved from searching an address book or spending time to determine recipient person's name, E-mail address, destination phone number, destination fax number, destination pager number, destination LAN address, or the like").

Regarding claim 2, Kraft/Johnson teaches that the item is selected from the file by means of a clipboard (see Kraft column 2 lines 19-33; *"a working storage that holds data and programs used in said applications and storage means acting as a clipboard when copying and pasting data from one application to another"*).

Regarding claim 3, Kraft/Johnson teaches that more than one operations are traced and recorded (see Johnson column 1 line 54 through column 2 line 7; *"The history of distributions, including phone calls, phone mail, pager notifications, fax jobs, and print jobs, or the like, is saved in first-in-first-out order"*).

Regarding claim 5, Kraft/Johnson teaches that the file is a log file (see Johnson column 1 line 54 through column 2 line 7; *"The history of distributions, including phone calls, phone mail, pager notifications, fax jobs, and print jobs, or the like, is saved in first-in-first-out order"*, where the saved history of distributions is equivalent to a log file).

Regarding claim 6, Kraft/Johnson teaches that at least one of the following operations: handling, receiving, sending, downloading, creating, deleting, is traced (see Johnson column 1 line 54 through column 2 line 7; *"The history of distributions, including phone calls, phone mail, pager notifications, fax jobs, and print jobs, or the like, is saved in first-in-first-out order"*).

Regarding claim 7, Kraft/Johnson teaches that said item is a content of the operation or a property of the operation (see Kraft column 1 lines 46-55; *"identifying predetermined types of subitems in the contents of the data copied to the clipboard"*, once an operation is identified for pasting, Kraft teaches allowing a user to identify content from the operation for pasting).

Regarding claim 8, Kraft/Johnson teaches that the source application and the target application are located within one application program (see Kraft column 1 lines 13-19; *"the copy and paste function can be used to copy text strings from one application to another or from one document in one application to another document in*

the same application or from one location in a document to another location in the same document").

Regarding claim 9, Kraft/Johnson teaches that the source application and the target application are located in different application programs (see Kraft column 1 lines 46-55; *"displaying said types of subitems for selection by the user upon reception of a pasting request for the data on the clipboard into said another application"*).

Regarding claim 11, Kraft/Johnson teaches that said file is shared between application programs of a computing device (see Kraft column 2 lines 19-33; *"storage means acting as a clipboard when copying and pasting data from one application to another"*, the file acting as the clipboard must inherently be shared between the source and destination applications).

Regarding claim 12, Kraft/Johnson teaches that a media type of the item is identified (see Kraft column 1 lines 46-55; *"identifying predetermined types of subitems in the contents of the data copied to the clipboard"*).

Regarding claim 13, Kraft/Johnson teaches that said media type belongs to one of the following groups: image, audio, video, text, URL, phonebook entry, music, calendar event, wallet and error message (see Kraft column 1 lines 56-67; *"These subitems may be ordinary words, phone numbers or dates"*).

Regarding claim 14, Kraft/Johnson teaches that said media type is used for classifying the item (see Kraft column 7 lines 9-16; *"classification is continued until it has been detected in step 57 that all the words stored in the RAM 15 during the analyzing have been classified. The words for classification are entered successively in step 58.*

Art Unit: 2175

Words including a string of continuous digits are classified as possible phone numbers in step 59").

Claims 15, 16, and 18-26 recite a device with substantially the same limitations as the method of claims 1-3, 5-9, and 11-14. Therefore, the claims are rejected under the same rationale.

Regarding claim 27, Kraft/Johnson teaches that the device is further configured for manual copying (see Kraft column 6 lines 31-42; *"The user moves the cursor 24 via the calendar menu 39 to the desired date in the calendar list 40 and selects "Copy"").*

Regarding claim 28, Kraft/Johnson teaches that the device is further configured for mobile communication (see Kraft claim 1; *"A method of transferring data from one application to another in an application handling unit of a mobile telephone controlling a plurality of applications"").*

Claim 29 recites a system for implementing the method of claim 1. Therefore, claim 29 is rejected under the same rationale as claim 1.

Claim 30 recites a computer program product with substantially the same limitations as the method of claim 1. Therefore, claim 30 is rejected under the same rationale.

Regarding claim 33, Kraft/Johnson teaches calling said file by the target application; selecting and pasting the item to said target application (see Kraft paragraph 1 lines 56-67; *"When the user requests the pasting of an item in the complex data structure into another application, a list of subitems will be displayed and the user may select the item which he finds appropriate to paste"").*

Regarding claim 37, Kraft/Johnson teaches that said file comprises items of different media types (see Kraft column 1 lines 56-67; “*These subitems may be ordinary words, phone numbers or dates*”).

Regarding claim 38, Kraft/Johnson teaches that said operation is a phone call and said item is a phone number; or said operation is a camera shot and said item is an image; or said operation is a site downloaded from a network and said item is the URL of the site (see Kraft column 1 lines 56-67; “*These subitems may be ordinary words, phone numbers or dates*”).

Claim 39 recites a device having substantially the same limitations as the method of claim 1. Therefore, claim 39 is rejected under the same rationale.

Claim 10 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kraft (6,309,305) *supra*, Johnson (6,005,928) *supra*, and Beged-Dov et al. (hereinafter Beged-Dov), United States Patent 6,983,328.

Regarding claim 10, Kraft/Johnson teaches every limitation of claim 10 except that the source application and the target application are located in different devices. However, Beged-Dov teaches a Trusted Internet Clipboard web service for copying from a source web application to a target web application (see Beged-Dov column 2 lines 11-26; “*using an intermediary Trusted Internet Clipboard web service to loosely couple source and destination web services for the purpose of efficiently and securely transferring resource(s) from the source web service to the destination web service without requiring the resource(s) to be intermediately transferred to and from an end-*

user's client computer", web services are capable of residing on different server devices). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide the copying and pasting between different web service applications as taught by Beged-Dov with the copy and paste user interface taught by Kraft/Johnson in order to allow copy and paste operations between remote applications.

Claims 34 and 35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kraft (6,309,305) *supra*, Johnson (6,005,928) *supra*, and Goh et al. (hereinafter Goh), United States Patent Application 2006/0155811.

Regarding claim 34, Kraft/Johnson teaches every limitation of claim 34 except that a media type of said item belongs to one of the following groups: image, audio, video. Goh teaches a mobile device with clipboard features and makes use of MMS for viewing images (see Goh paragraph [0053]; *"The example embodiment further comprises file conversion techniques for the user to convert an attached file in a received email to an image file format or text format. For example, the resultant image file can be viewed via Multimedia Messaging Service (MMS), while the resultant text can be viewed via WAP"*, it is noted that MMS also inherently supports image, audio, and video). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide MMS messaging support as taught by Goh in the invention taught by Kraft/Johnson as a design choice to support the newer multimedia MMS format for messaging.

Regarding claim 35, Kraft/Johnson/Goh teaches that said target application is a multimedia messaging service message (see Goh paragraph [0053]; *"The example embodiment further comprises file conversion techniques for the user to convert an attached file in a received email to an image file format or text format. For example, the resultant image file can be viewed via Multimedia Messaging Service (MMS), while the resultant text can be viewed via WAP"*).

Claim 36 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kraft (6,309,305) *supra*, Johnson (6,005,928) *supra*, and Kumar, United States Patent Application 2005/0028008.

Regarding claim 36, Kraft/Johnson teaches every limitation of claim 36 except that the method further comprises presenting said item in a list utilizing a check-box feature for selecting. Kumar teaches utilizing a check-box feature for selecting files to paste from a clipboard (see Kumar paragraph [0114]; *"Paste File(s) from Clipboard: This function allows the user to paste or insert all the selected files (via checkbox) to the selected Folder"*). Both Kumar and Kraft/Johnson utilize a clipboard for pasting multiple items. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to utilize a check-box feature for selecting files to paste as taught by Kumar in the invention of Kraft/Johnson to provide a standard way of selecting several items at once.

Response to Arguments

Minor correction has been made in the specification to correct grammatical and spelling errors and to add the word "handling" to paragraph [0040]. Accordingly, the objection to the specification is withdrawn.

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-3, 5-16, 18-30, and 33 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection. Newly introduced prior art Johnson (6,005,928) *supra* is relied upon to teach substantially the same limitations as previously cited prior art IBM technical disclosure bulletin NA9309583. However, there is more motivation to combine the teachings of Kraft and Johnson because they are similar inventions. It is further noted that the scope of the recited invention is believed to be changed with the instant amendment because the tracing and recording is now performed automatically, without requiring a user to manually select and copy content to place it into the clipboard.

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within

TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to STEPHEN ALVESTEFFER whose telephone number is (571)270-1295. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 9:30AM-6:00PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, William Bashore can be reached on (571)272-4088. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Art Unit: 2175

Stephen Alvesteffer
Examiner
Art Unit 2175

/S. A./
Examiner, Art Unit 2175

/William L. Bashore/
William L. Bashore
Primary Examiner
Tech Center 2100